Doctrine of the Priesthood

Let Virtue garnish thy thoughts unceasingly; then shall thy Confidence wax strong in the presence of God; and the Doctrine of the Priesthood shall Distil upon thy soul as the Dews from Heaven. (D & C 121:45)

February 1981 Salt Lake City, Utah Vol. 1 No. 2

Re-Examining the Lorin Woolley Story

Collier's Publishing Co.

Copyright
by
Fred C. Collier
All Rights Reserved

Copies may be obtained
by writing

Collier's Publishing Co.
HC 63 Box 1B
Hanna, Utah 84031
Telephone (801) 305-3227
email:collierspublishing@gmail.com
fredccollier@gmail.com

Introduction

Since the rise of Mormon Fundamentalism in the 1920s, there has been a growing controversy over the early history of its beginnings. The Fundamentalist position has been that their beginning actually commenced in 1886, when the Resurrected Prophet Jospeh Smith and Jesus Christ appeared to President John Taylor. According to Fundamentalism, these Deified beings prophetically directed President Taylor to set apart and commission five men with authority to perpetuate plural marriage. The understanding was that the special Priesthood Dispensation of these men would not commence until a future time — not until after the leaders of the Church Elected to abandon the practice of Plural/Celestial Marriage.

The Fundamentalist faith, as expressed above, is predicated upon the testimony of Lorin Woolley, who bore record that he was an eye witness to said events, and that these things took place in September 1886, while President Taylor was living in his father's home, at Centerville, Utah.

President Taylor's stay at the Woolley home is not disputed. His two month residence with the Woolleys came as a consequence of his steadfast resistance to the *immoral mandates* and *tyrannical laws* of the United States Government. During the last two and a half years of his life, President Taylor chose to go into hiding and live on the "underground", rather than submit to harassment, arrest and imprisonment at the hands of federally appointed Carpetbag Officials from Washington.

The Constitution declares that "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of a Religion" — but the Constitution be damned, the Federal Government of the United States deliberately enacted laws with the intent of outlawing the Mormon religion in their practice of Plural Marriage. Through these laws, the way was opened for Federal Prosecution of the Church and its leaders. At long last, the enemies of Christ finally succeeded in placing the Restored Church where they wanted it. According to the *unconstitutional "laws"* as enacted by Congress, the Church was disincorporated as a legal entity and its property escheated to Carpetbag Officials from Washington. On top of this, no Mormon could immigrate to the United States and no Mormon could vote, hold public office, or sit on a jury. As if all this were not enough, all Church leaders who had more than one wife (and this included almost all of them) were made out to be Criminals — They were legislated into being Fugitives from "justice", who could "lawfully" be hunted down and put in Prison, or shot to death, as some were, should they dare to resist

arrest. In short, the Mormon people were denied their Constitutional rights as citizens of the United States on a wholesale basis.

As already stated, President Taylor's stay at the Woolley home is not disputed — what is disputed is the question as to whether or not the events which Lorin Woolley described in his story are true, especially the Miraculous appearance of the Prophet Joseph Smith and Jesus Christ and the Ordination of five men with the mission to Perpetuate Plural Marriage.

J. Max Anderson has published a book wherein he has character assassinated Lorin Woolley and challenged the historicity of his Testimony. Of course, his reason for doing this, is to discredit Mormon Fundamentalism. As this issue of *Doctrine of the Priesthood* demonstrates, all in all, the historical record would argue hard for the idea that some concessions and honest confessions are in order and long overdue from the parties of both sides of the Controversy.

An abbreviated version of this paper appeared in the Summer 1980 issue of *Dialogue* magazine ("Tannering Fundamentalism" Vol. 13, No. 2; pp. 130–32) as a critique of J. Max Anderson's book, *The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact*.

Re-Examining the Lorin Woolley Story

by
Fred C. Collier

During the early part of the 20th Century, Lorin C. Woolley of Centerville, Utah, produced affidavits in which he maintained that on September 26 and 27, 1886, Jesus Christ and Joseph Smith appeared to President John Taylor while he resided in the home of John W. Woolley (his father) and there revealed to him (Taylor) that the Mormon Church would some day abandon the practice of plural marriage. Joseph Smith at that time directed Taylor to appoint and ordain five men to perpetuate plural marriage after the Church had relinquished the practice. Subsequently told and retold, the Lorin Woolley Story came to form the foundation of priesthood authority for most polygamist offshoots of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, adherents of which sects now number into the tens of thousands.

The Anderson Critique

J. Max Anderson has undertaken a monumental labor in behalf of mainstream Mormonism in an attempt to discredit Woolley's testimony. His recent book *The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact* (Salt Lake City: Publishers Press, 1979) is the first of a projected three-volume attack, the culmination of ten

years of research on his part as well as the assistance of many others who helped him along the way. Placing the Woolley story under the microscope, Anderson critically analyzes every minute detail — names, dates, places and events — and successfully does to the foundation of modern Fundamentalism what the Tanners (Modern Microfilm) have done to Mormonism. Undoubtedly, Anderson has dealt a heavy blow to the growth of modern-day polygamy. In its effectiveness, the book is long strides ahead of all its predecessors, including *The Way of the Master* by Mark E. Peterson, *Plural Marriage Limited* by Paul E. Reimann, and ". . . *Some That Trouble You* . . ." by Clair L. Wyatt.

Anderson attempts to force Fundamentalists to view the records of their beginnings from the same perspective that Jews must view the complete historical void of Israel's four-hundred year sojourn in Egypt — "Reference to them was stricken from the records," they say. In religious matters, whenever facts and evidence are lacking, faith will always fill the void. But Fundamentalists are not altogether without justification in their feeling that there is evidence to support their position. The suppression of Church records in the past, especially in a selective way by denying those who believe in the old ways access even to the General Archives, has created a great suspicion for the Church in the minds of thousands of Fundamentalist-believing people, who feel that the problem is not in a genuine lack of extant evidence but in its inaccessibility in the hands of those whose purposes the truth would not serve.

After dredging up every conceivable inconsistency, Anderson simply labels Woolley a consummate liar. Then, turning abruptly from historian to psychoanalyst, the architect-author proceeds to probe into Woolley's personality to get at the cause of the whole matter. "What would motivate Woolley to make such claims under the guise of truth?" he asks.

After analyzing several of his subject's dreams, Anderson deduces that Woolley was merely a man seeking for attention and grasping for honor and power. In coming to this conclusion, he is forced to nullify the testimony of two eye witnesses to the Woolley story, those of Patriarch John W. Woolley and Daniel R. Bateman, both of whom lived and died affirming its validity. The strategy with which he approaches this problem is typical of other attacks made against the witnesses of the Book of Mormon. It thus gradually begins to dawn upon the reader that Anderson's intent is to destroy Fundamentalist faith with the same weapons the anti-Mormons have used since Joseph Smith emerged from the woods in 1820.

Selective Research

However effective the Anderson work might be, it is thus not without its shortcomings. Unfortunately, the author did not choose to take the posture of a fair-minded judge or that of an honest historian, willing to look at all

sides of the story. Instead, he chose to play the role of a prosecuting attorney. Anxious to win the case for his client (the Mother Church) he carefully sifted his source materials, selecting for use only those that were to the credit of his client. In short, his zealousness to defend the faith has obscured his objectivity. Super-critical of Lorin Woolley, Anderson either altogether neglects to mention or downplays the significance of any information that tends to support his opponent, even though such information is often vital to the very issues he addresses.

A more impartial examination of the Lorin Woolley affidavits would explain at the outset that they come from what historians term a secondary source. They are so classed because they were recorded more than twenty-six years after the 1886 events had transpired. Labeling a document does not necessarily determine its accuracy or inaccuracy, but without question it is relevant information. One small slip of memory, such as a wrong date or place, or a small detail in an incident, can incorporate all kinds of historical problems into an otherwise accurate account, and secondary source materials are those which are most likely to contain such errors.

Anderson's primary attack thus zeroes in on nit-picking trivia. He creates an iron bedstead based on details furnished in Woolley's story and then uses them to their own discredit by comparing them to contemporary records. But while such tactics make for good polemics, they do not meet the standards of a competent historian. It is rare for any secondary source to meet the exactness of contemporary records, especially in such things as dates. This does not mean that all such accounts are therefore untrue, which is what Anderson implies. He neglects to mention that the only accounts of the First Vision and numerous other events sacred to Mormon-faith come from such sources.

Lorin Woolley in his first affidavit states that he did not remember the exact date, but he thought it was in the latter part of September. His uncertainty concerning other details is again expressed later on in the same account — "and at a meeting that afternoon at which a number there were present, and myself. . . ." In the original document the names of several persons who were supposedly at this meeting were written down and then crossed out. Obviously, Woolley was not altogether sure who was there. In later accounts Woolley attached the date of September 26th and 27th, 1886, to his story and even went on to add names which before he could not remember. It is these kinds of apparent inconsistencies, forgotten, yet later remembered, and added details that furnish Anderson with all the needed ammunition to discredit Woolley's testimony. Yet, ironic as it may seem, and contrary to what Anderson has written, *except in the case of dates*, it is these added details that serve most effectively to vindicate his story. It is also important to note that Anderson does not produce a single fact to dispute the affidavit of October 6, 1912.

The Lorin Woolley Story did not come from a vacuum; it has its basis in historical fact and can be verified by contemporary records, but it must be remembered that *it did not come from these records*. The Woolley story is based on recollections of Lorin Woolley which were verbalized over a period of years from 1886 to 1929, more than 43 years after the event. The earliest written account that has so far come to light was recorded in 1912. During the years which followed, Lorin C. Woolley, John W. Woolley, and Daniel R. Bateman became some of the principal speakers at cottage meetings that were held by those who were not in harmony with church policy concerning the practice of plural marriage. Minutes were kept at many of these meetings, and in 1929, Joseph W. Musser merged these statements into one flowing account. They were then presented to Lorin C. Woolley for his approval and signature. John W. Woolley had died in 1928, one year earlier, but notes on his speeches were also taken at the time and have been preserved. These minutes, coupled with the testimony of many eye witnesses still living who personally knew John W. Woolley and Daniel R. Bateman (and with whom I have had recorded interviews), all go to show beyond any reasonable doubt that both John W. Woolley and Daniel R. Bateman lived and died as faithful eye witnesses to the statements made by Lorin Woolley concerning this matter.

The Cover Up

In examining the claims of the Woolley story, it becomes crucial to first establish the extent to which the Woolleys were involved with President Taylor during the period in question. For this information we are indebted almost entirely to the diaries of Samuel Bateman. Not that these diaries are the only ones extant pertaining to the subject; at least four others are more complete. There is, for example, the personal diary of President Taylor, as well as the personal diary of George Q. Cannon, the First Presidency's Office Journal, and the personal diary of L. John Nuttall. Nuttall kept extensive diaries while serving as secretary to Presidents Young, Taylor, and Woodruff. He daily recorded many details of each day's activities in his diaries, which are now in the possession of BYU. But strange as it may seem, while most all the other Nuttall diaries are present and accounted for, those covering the underground period from 1885 through 1887 are missing. The Taylor diaries are presently located in the First Presidency's Office Vault and are not available for research. No one is allowed to see them, not even Taylor's descendants. The Church normally allows children and grandchildren open access to the diaries of their parents and grandparents, but in the case of the Taylor materials a curious exception has been made. Both Raymond and Samuel W. Taylor have asked to see the diaries of their grandfather without success. Indeed, the Church has been slow even to acknowledge that it has them; undoubtedly the underlying reason being

that doing so would commit them to their own policy. The Cannon diaries and the First Presidency's Office Journals are in the same vault as the Taylor diaries. They also are unavailable for research, although in 1971, through the consent of the First Presidency I was allowed to read the entries for September 26th and 27th, 1886, and to photograph them. These photos appear in Anderson's book. However neither myself, nor Anderson have been permitted to see these records aside from those two days. And so it is, the four most important diaries pertaining to this period of time in church history are locked away; one cannot help but wonder what it is they contain that makes them so confidential!

In about 1975, a friend of mine Knute J. Knuteson wrote to the First Presidency's office requesting permission for access to the diaries of President John Taylor. One of the Secretaries (i.e.Francis Marion Gibbons) responded to the letter, stating that the Taylor diaries were not being made available for research, clearly suggesting that the diaries were in the possession of the First Presidency.

Just before the April conference of 1980, I called the First Presidency's office and talked to Gibon who wrote this letter, in hopes of resolving the question in precise terms. I told him that I had been asked to do a book review on a new book, and that I was doing research on the subject. I told him about the letter which he had written several years before. At this point he became very upset that I should have in my possession a copy of a letter which he had written. Since he had not sent the letter to me, what business did I have with it. He stated that he was worried about being quoted, and getting in trouble with the brethren for saying something in an unguarded moment, which he should not have said. After assuring him that I had no desire to cause him grief, I pointed out to him that his response to my friend inferred that the First Presidency's Office had the Taylor diaries in their possession, and asked him if such was the case. He responded saying: "Yes, we have them."

I asked him again: "Are you sure that they are the personal diaries of President Taylor and not the First Presidency's Office Journals." I then explained to him that I had been allowed to see the Cannon diaries and the First Presidency's Office Journal back in 1971 by Joseph Anderson and carefully explained to him the difference between these diaries and the personal diaries of President Taylor. I then carefully and pointedly asked him again, "are you sure that the diaries which you have are the personal diaries of President Taylor?"

"Well, I think we still have them. Just a minute and I will go and check", whereupon he left the phone. A moment later he returned to the phone and affirmed that President Taylor's diaries were there in the office.

I then explained to him that the personal diaries of L. John Nuttall for the most part were at the BYU Library, but that the diaries for the years 1885–87 were missing, and I asked him if he knew where they were, to which he responded, "Yes, we have them."

I then asked him again, "Are you sure that they are the personal diaries of L. John Nuttall and not the Office Journals of the First Presidency? I explained to him that the First Presidency's Office Journals were kept by L. John Nuttall and that they were written in his handwriting. "Are you sure that you are not confusing Nuttall's personal diaries with the First Presidency's Office Journals."

"Yes", he said, "We have the Nuttall diaries." "Why do you ask? You are not one of those who have been cut off from the Church are you? Are you a member of the Church?"

"Well I was born and raised in the Church, but I was excommunicated back in 1975 for believing in the Adam-God doctrine.

"Oh!!! Just a minute, let me check again and make sure?" . . . . . .

"Nope, we don't have the Taylor diaries, I was mistaken! We have the First Presidency's Office Journals and the Cannon diaries, but we don't have the Taylor diaries."

"Well do you have the Nuttall diaries?"

"No, we don't, they are at BYU."

"Well I appreciate your time, brother X."

"O.K."

"Thank you."

"Goodbye."

John M. Whitaker furnishes us with another typical example of efforts to suppress records concerning events in this period of Church history. Whitaker worked in the Church Historian's Office under the direction of Apostle Franklin D. Richards and made daily entries in his diaries which were recorded in Pittman Shorthand. Years later during the 1940s and 1950s (after the Church had relinquished the practice of plural marriage), he transcribed these journals into longhand. Whitaker transcribed his entry for September 16, 1888, as follows:

In the evening President Woodruff sent for me and asked me to help him i[n] some matters at the historian office. Brother [Samuel] Bateman his guard came also and brother and sister Richens, with whom Brother Woodruff spent a long time in giving them counsel. During this time Brother Bateman told me of many interesting incidents in the life of President Woodruff of late

I have omitted a num[b]er of very interesting matters in this transcript, as I feel they would not contribute particularly to my purpose in keeping in touch with religious, political, cultural and economic and general church and national trends? (Diary of John M. Whitaker, September 16, 1888, Manuscripts, University of Utah Library)

It is safe to assume that those interesting matters which he neglected to transcribe had to do with Plural Marriage. Polygamy was the major issue of that day, which by the 1940's "would not contribute particularly" to his "purpose" of "keeping in touch with . . . general church and national trends." We learn from a more complete transcript that Whitaker later made of his journals, that at least part of the record which he desired to conceal had to

do with "interesting incidents that occurred while" Bateman served as guard for President John Taylor. He added the following to his transcript:

> Brother Bateman told me many very interesting incidents that occurred while he was with him [Woodruff], and also with the late President John Taylor. And I am leaving out of my written history some incidents that *at the time seemed very important*, but better be preserved from being written at least for the present, as I feel they would not contribute particularly to my *present purpose* in keeping in touch with the religious, cultural economic and *general church welfare and necessary historical trends*. (Whitaker Diary, 16 September 1888)

Samuel Bateman was a witness to the Woolley story, and it is possible that it was his account of the 1886 vision, etc., "that at the time" in 1888 "seemed very important" to Whitaker, but which by the 1940's did not seem to "keep in touch with" "general church welfare and necessary historical trends."

Other materials that have been fortunate enough to escape the Church's veil of secrecy, such as the diaries of Samuel Bateman, do not in any way dispute the Lorin Woolley Story in terms of its scope and meaning.* Bateman was President Taylor's personal body guard during the underground days, but his diaries mention very little concerning business transactions. He usually mentions the comings and goings of prominent people from the DO.† and the names of the mail carriers as far as he observed them. He habitually mentioned fast meetings that were held every fourth Thursday, and Sunday meetings, with the number of brethren, sisters, and children who attended, but he never recorded the topic of discussion beyond "had a good meeting", or the names of those who were present beyond prominent visitors, speakers, and who presided. While he always mentioned these meetings, he almost never mentioned other meetings held during the week with visitors to the President, or the presence or activities of other people who were typically around the DO. He does often mention the presence and activities of his son, Daniel R. Bateman, a witness to the Woolley story who was also employed as a guard to President Taylor. He kept a good record of sporting activities which took place at the DO, such as pitching quoits (horseshoes), the only physical exercise President Taylor had, and playing checkers.

---

*It is interesting to note that Gustive O. Larson in his recent book *The Americanization of Utah for Statehood* quotes extensively from the Bateman diaries as he describes the activities of the First Presidency during the underground period. Yet he entirely neglects to mention the President's stay at the White home and the three month sojourn at the Woolley residence. He even goes so far as to misrepresent the facts, stating that the President was staying in Bountiful rather than Centerville.

†DO. was a code name for the underground hideout of the First Presidency.

Lorin Woolley Story

Woolley begins his story by describing background events which brought pressure to bear on President Taylor to make concessions concerning the practice of plural marriage:

> While the brethren were at the Carlisle residence [in Murray] in May or June of 1886 letters began to come to President John Taylor from such men as John Sharp, Horace Eldredge, William Jennings, John T. Caine, Abraham Hatch, President Cluff and many other leading men from all over the Church asking the leaders to *do something** as the gentiles were talking of confiscating their property in connection with the property of the Church. These letters not only came from those who were living in the plural marriage relation, but also from prominent men who were presiding from various offices in the church who were not living in that relation. They all urged that *something be done*** to satisfy the gentiles so that their property would not be confiscated. (*Polygamy Story: Fiction & Fact* p. 5)

---

*See note ***

See note *

———)(———

The Carlisle Residence

President Taylor's itinerary demonstrates an error in Woolley's date and chronology for the President's stay at the Carlisle residence. In May and June of 1886 Taylor was staying at the homes of Alfred Solomon and Henry Day in Salt Lake City. The President's itinerary indicates that the DO. was located at the Carlisle residence on three different occasions. His first stay was for one day and night on the 14th and 15th of July 1885. He again stopped at the Carlisle residence on September 28th, 1885, where he remained until the 2nd of October. They returned for the last time on January 10, 1886 and remained there until January 20th. Thus while the record bears out Woolley's statement that Taylor stayed at the Carlisle residence, it does not confirm his date. Yet notwithstanding this, positive evidence in support of Woolley's testimony, Anderson focuses on the fact that it is the wrong date and argues for total contradiction.

Letters of Complaint

Woolley states that letters of complaint "began to come to President Taylor" from "leading men from all over the Church asking the leaders to *do something*." The following is one of these letters. It was sent anonomously and arrived at the DO. during the President's last stay at the Carlisle residence in January of 1886. This letter vindicates Woolley's memory in an incredable way as Woolley quotes it verbatim on three counts. He states that the letters

requested President Taylor to "do something" and that "something [should] be done".*** Notice the words in italics in the letter which follows:

***See notes ** and *. It is significant that the Bateman diaries would indicate that the Woolleys did not become involved with President Taylor until 9 months later when the President's hide out was located at the Woolley home. The Bateman diary begins on August 26th, 1886 and continues with regular entries until March of 1888, where there is a gap in the diary until January 1st of 1899. Samuel Batemen was employed as a body guard for President Taylor, and from the very first entry it is shown that his son Daniel R. Bateman was involved with him in his work. Undoubtedly, both Samuel and Daniel were present when this letter arrived and came under discussion at the DO. This along with other evidence would indicate that the Lorin Wooley Story is actually a composite of statements coming not just from Lorin Woolley, but from his father John Woolley and Daniel R. Bateman as well, with this part of the story coming from the memory of Daniel R. Bateman.

———)(———

President Taylor:
Dear Brother

I write you in kindly and brotherly love. You are hidden away and cannot know the true feelings of our people, and those that surround you are afraid to tell you if they know. There is a general murmur, a feeling of uncertainty that has not been manifested since the days of Nauvoo.

The people say that you and Cannon and Smith have run away and left the masses to go to the penetentiary or humiliate themselves before the courts as they may, and if they take the latter course you ostracize them like you have Sharp; you will force men to go to the pen when you will not go yourselves.

The murmurings go so far as to say if Brother Brigham were with us it would be otherwise, and wish for a man that [c]ould lead us out of the darkness. Why does not some one come to the front and save our people from division? If things continue in this way much longer, there will be more danger within than without the Church. . . . .

Something should be done, by your course you are not uniting the people, but you are setting one part of the polygamists who want to obey the laws of the land against those that will not obey them, but hide or go into court and swear falsely. You will do nothing for us, how in the name of God can you still claim to be a leader when you have ceased to be a leader, but instead become divider. Why do you not *do something* for the people? What hope have you? You proclaim to the world that there are 2 per cent polygamists and 98 per cent monogamists, now with half of those in polygamy going back on it, and the other half hiding away, what do you expect to accomplish? In a word why do you not advise the people to obey the law of the land you live in and get an enabling act passed by Congress and get Utah admitted as a State. In this way put a stop to all the wrangling and let peace come to so many unhappy families.

You are hardly aware of the many polygamists that sneak to the Governor and through him get a pardon from the President and go about their homes as usual. Many saints that have been in the Church since the beginning say that your admin-

istration consists of nothing except contrariness . . . . . You are notorious for ignoring ***the peoples will*** . . . . .

I do not want you to come out and go to the pen, but what I and all the people *do* want is for you to *do something*. Save us from division and contention within and reproach from without. . . . .

We appealed to the highest tribunal as a last resort but this did no good, now what can we do? Take it to the Lord and from his silence he plainly says, "I have heard the cries of the daughters of Zion, I have counted the broken hearts of the many women who have been sent to their graves on account of Polygamy, and I will with draw for a season until my people shall repent.

If you do not want to take the responsibility of doing away with polygamy upon yourself you can do this: order an election of all the people and let them say Yes or No without fear or hinderance, and you will see for yourself how they feel, and you will be exonerated from all blame; or, if you do not want to do that why do you not go to Mexico and take all those that want to still continue the practice, and there is peace, and the 98 per cent can obey the law, and I will promise a greater adherence to the Church than you can now conceive of. (Taylor Papers, Manuscripts, University of Utah Library)

CONFISCATION OF PROPERTY

Woolley mentions that "the Gentiles were talking of confiscating their property in connection with the property of the Church. . . . They all urged that something be done to satisfy the gentiles so that their property would not be confiscated." John M. Whitaker offers what may be supportive evidence of this contention in his diary entry for May 30, 1887. He states that the "Utah Ministerial Association" headed by the "Right Reverent T. C. Illiff" was "going all over the nation preaching against the Mormons and their religion and arousing religious hate and bigotry in the hearts of men and women. . . .

He is the author of this intense religious persecution now seeking four million votes to file with the Committee of Privileges and Election at Washington, disfranchising our people, and also to take away our property and denying us of the right to hold property. This is what the protestant Churches are now doing in this nation. (John M. Whitaker Journal, May 30, 1887)

Just exactly how far we might interpret this statement to refer to personal or church property is not certain. It was not unusual for Saints in general and church agents in particular to identify themselves with the Church when speaking of its properties. Lorin Woolley furnishes us with a clear example of this in a statement which he made in a meeting, at the home of Nathan Clark, in Bountiful, Utah. He refers to financial men speaking of Church banks as their own:

The outsiders were not responsible for the issuing of the Manifesto, but the responsibility rests upon the shoulders of such men as George Q. Cannon, Bp. Hyrum Clawson, James Jack, Franklin S. Richards and John T. Cain, who worked incessantly with Pres. John Taylor, from June to Sept. of 1886, to get him to sign a Manifesto. Other men who wrote letters urging the issuing of the Manifesto, were W. W. Riter, Ira Hinckley, W. W. Cluff, Abram Hatch and scores of other financial men. After the death of John Taylor, these men were hammering Pres. Woodruff to death, trying to get a Manifesto. They cried, `We want a Manifesto or we will lose our property. The Gentiles will take it. They will take our banks, etc.!' They finally succeeded to get Pres. Woodruff to surrender to them in 1890. (Items from the Book of Remembrance of Joseph W. Musser, August 6, 1922 p. 4)

On another occasion Woolley stated that it was both Church and personal property that were in jeopardy:

Manifesto: Shortly before Wilford Woodruff issued the Manifesto, he was shown by the Lord two courses in vision:

1st: Stand for the law and let the Gentiles and government confiscate both Church and individual property, and leave the battle for the lord to fight.

2nd: Issue the Manifesto, hold on to the property, but open the way for whoredom and destruction among the people, the result of rejecting the perfect law of social conduct. (Items from the Book of Remembrance of Joseph W. Musser, August 6, 1922, p. 26)

In his book, Anderson attempts to debunk Woolley's statement by proving just the opposite, namely, that legal title to Church property was being transferred into the hands of Church leaders, in order to protect it from being confiscated by the Federal Government. However, as we shall see, notwithstanding Anderson's arguments, Woolley's statement is founded in fact on both counts. Both Church and personal property were in jeopardy, but we will leave this subjct for the present, and give a more complete discussion of it later on.

The Manifesto of 1885

According to Lorin Woolley, some kind of Manifesto concerning plural marriage was under discussion when the DO. was located at the Carlisle residence and supposedly Cannon had organized a committee to wait upon that matter:

George Q. Cannon on his own initiative selected a committee comprising himself, Hyrum B. Clawson, Franklin S. Richards, John T. Caine and James Jack to get up a statement or Manifesto that would meet the objections urged by the brethren above named. They met from time to time to discuss the situation. (*The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact*, p. 5)

If these issues were raised when the DO. was located at the Carlisle residence, it would had to have been either in July or September of 1885, or in January 1886. Anderson demonstrates in his book that these issues were raised in 1885, but lacks specific information as to the date and whereabouts of the First Presidency when the matter was under discussion. He also attempts to refute the idea that Cannon was in favor of them. Other information would suggest that not only did Cannon favor such a document, but that he may well have been its author, and that he also inspired at least two others which followed it. The records indicate that Cannon was actively involved in heading a movement which was pushing for concession as early as the Spring of 1885, and that he continued his activities until 1890 when the object in view was finally accomplished.* Not only so, but with the possible exception of Hyrum B. Clawson, the other individuals whom Woolley names were all involved in it. But this also is another story — let us leave it for a later time in this paper, when it can be dealt with more completely. Suffice it to say that the Manifesto which Anderson mentions in his book was presented to President Taylor and the brethren in September 1885 by Dr. Miller, and is the one mentioned by Lorin Woolley in his story. It was under discussion when the DO. was located at the Carlisle residence from the 28th of September until the 2nd of October 1885, but as Cannon expressed it over a month later in a letter to Dr. Miller:

> After conversing with our leading men I am satisfied that *the plan which I mentioned to you* could not at present be carried out. There are obstacles in the way which could not be overcome with feelings which now exist here on all sides. It would be difficult, if not impossible to form a coalition of the elements necessary to make the plan feasible. (George Q. Cannon letter to George L. Miller, November 19th, 1885, Grover Cleveland Papers, Library of Congress, Washington D. C.)

---

*In stating that Cannon was involved in pushing for concession or a manifesto, I do not mean to infer that he had any intentions of terminating the practice of plural marriage. Quite to the contrary, as his later activities demonstrate, it was his intention that the practice of plural marriage be perpetuated forever. But notwithstanding this, it was Cannon's desire to make promises or concessions to the government, without any indention of keeping them. By this means it was hoped that the Church would be relieved of all legal responsibility for the individual actions of the Saints and the government would be under the necessity of terminating its legal prosecution and persecution against the Church. So the responsibility of the Principle would devolve upon the individual rather than the Church.

In this regard it is interesting that while the 1886 revelation to President Taylor clearly states that the practice of Plural Marriage could never be abrogated or done away with, still it seems to establish a precedent for Cannons hopes, by placing the responsibility on the individual rather than the Church:

Have I not given my word in great plainness on this subject? Yet have not great numbers of my people been negligent in the observance of my law and the keeping of my commandment, and yet have I borne with them these many years and this because of their weakness because of the perilous times. And furthermore *it is more pleasing to me that men should use their free agency in regard to these matters*.. Nevertheless I the Lord do not change and my word and my covenants and my law do not." (*UPR* 88:4–6)

Years later, in 1911, Apostle John W. Taylor (who was President Taylor's son) in process of making his defense before the quorum of the Twelve, for taking a new wife, he altered one word in the above revelation, changing the word "more" to "now" with the obvious intent of infering that the Lord had made a policy change, by placing the responsibility on the individual rather than the Church. (*UPR*, 2nd. edition, p. 206; The Trials of Apostle John W. Taylor and Matthias F. Cowley, published in *Doctrine of the Priesthood* , January 1987, Vol. 4 No. 1, p. 7, 9)

———)(———

Underground Itinerary

From the White home, where President Taylor and company stopped, after leaving the Carlisle home, they came out to fathers. (*The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact*, p. 5)

Here again Woolley is off on his chronology and dates. After leaving the Carlisle home for the last time on January 20, 1886, President Taylor and company moved to the home of Frank Armstrong. They remained there until the 8th of February when they moved to the home of Alfred Solomon. On March the 11th they removed to the residence of S. J. Sudbury. It was not until the 16th of March 1886 that the President and party vacated the Sudbury residence and relocated at the home of William White and Sons. President Taylor and company moved to and from the White home on three different occasions. The first stay extended from the 16th of March to the 10th of June 1886. The second stay, was from September 5th to the 14th, at which time they moved to the home of John W. Woolley. The third stay was from November 3rd to the 9th at which time they again returned to the Woolley home.

Contrary to what Anderson has written, while Woolley's chronology on the move from the Carlisle home was off, he was right about President Taylor's move from the White home to his father's, not just once but twice. This is only natural, as Woolley would be more thoroughly acquainted with things which he personally witnessed. It is significant that Anderson would write what he has concerning Taylor's itinerary in an attempt to contradict Woolley's story, and then through an oversight, inadvertently print the proof to the opposite in a document on the facing page in his book, whereby Woolley's statement is confirmed. (see pages 24–26)

Itinerary
of
President John Taylor
in Exile

In Bro. *Taylor*^[s] Exile he stoped at the following:

Feb 1st 1 Bishop Bennion . . . . . Taylor villa
Feb 10th Bishops's sister-in Law Bennion . . . . . Taylor ville
Feb 15th Chas Bagley . . . . . Big Cottonwood
Feb 20th Peter Hansen . . . . . Sugarhouse Ward
March 28th David James Farm Sam Obray . . . . . North Point (over Jordon)
July 11th 2 Bishop Bennion . . . . . Taylorvilla (took a trip to Nephi)
July 14th 2 John Carlisle . . . . . Millcreek
July 15th Mormie Hintze . . . . . East Millcreek
July 17th 2 Peter Hansen . . . . . Sugar House Ward
Aug 13 George Gaylie . . . . . East Millcreek
Aug 19th James Godfrey . . . . . South Cottonwood
Sept 28th 3 John Carlisle . . . . . .Mill Creek
Oct. 2nd 2 James Godfrey . . . . . South Cottonwood
Dec. 9th Wm Taylor . . . . . Little Cottonwood
Dec. 10th 3 James Godfrey . . . . . S-C-
Jan 10th 4 John Carlisle . . . . . North Creek[?]
Jan 20th Frank Armstrong . . . . . 11 Ward Salt Lake City
Feb. 8th Alfred Solomon . . . . . 19th Ward Salt Lake City
March 11th S. J. Sudbury . . . . . City Creek Canyon
March 16th Wm White & sons . . . . . 16th Ward S. L. C.
June 10th 2 Alfred Solomon . . . . . .19th W. S. L. C.
June 30th Henry Day . . . . . Draper
July 12th James Livingston . . . . . Stone Quarrie Little Cottonwood
July 14th 4 James Godfrey . . . . . South Cottonwood
July 15th 2 Henry Day . . . . . Draper
July 18th 1 Bishop Stuart . . . . . Draper
July 20th 3 Henry Day . . . . . Draper
July 27th 2 Bishop Stuart . . . . . Draper
Aug 6 4 Henry Day . . . . . Draper
We got a false alarm at 3 0'clock
in the morning & we fled to:
Sept. 5th George Stringfellow . . . . . Draper & at night here he dreamed of the Deputies & went:
Sept 5t 2 Wm White & sons . . . . . 16th Ward S. L. C.
in the night to
Sept. 14th John W. Woolley . . . . . Centerville
Oct. 11th Orren Randall . . . . . Centerville
Oct. 12th 2 John W. Woolley . . . . . Centerville

Nov 3rd 3 Wm White & sons . . . . . 16 Ward S. L. C.
Nov 9th 3 J. W. Woolley . . . . . Centerville
Nov 22nd Thomas F. Roueche . . . . . Keys Ward [Kaysville]
we staid there untill up to
July 26, 1887 when we all came home
(John Taylor Letter file, Church Historian's Office, Box 24, File No. 4; also Taylor Papers, Manuscripts, University of Utah Library; also Taylor Papers, Manuscripts, University of Utah)

The Woolley Connection

The Bateman diaries reveal that President Taylor and company moved to the John W. Woolley home at Centerville, Utah, on the 14th of September, 1886. This move was brought about because of a dream which President Taylor had on the night of September 12–13th, warning him that if they did not leave their present hiding place (the residence of William White and Sons in Salt Lake City, 16th Ward), they would be raided by federal deputies:

All day at Do, that is H. C. Birrell and myself. This morning about three o'clock, the President, G. Q. Cannon, L. J. Nuttall, and C. H. Wilkin's went away. We started to pack the things. On the 5 of this month, we came here. On the 8 late in the afternoon while the President and H. C. Birrell were sitting in the room, the globe burst on the lamp all to pieces and flew all over the floor. This seemed to bother the President, and on the night of the 12 and 13 the breaking of the globe was interpreted to him in a dream that the deputies surprised us and we were scattered and nary two of us were together. . . . At night a team came and we loaded up and left Bro. White's. John Woolley [son of John W. Woolley] was the teamster. We arrived at his father's place about one o'clock, found the rest of the brethren all right. (Diary of Samuel Bateman, September 14, 1886, Special Collections, BYU Library)

President Taylor and party remained in the Woolley home from the 14th of September until the 11th of October, when they fled to the home of Orren Randall because of a false alarm delivered by Daniel R. Bateman:

the 11[th] All day at Do, reading, pitching quoits. About 11 o'clock at night, D[aniel] R. B[ateman] came with news that Cap. Edens knew where we were and that the United States Marshal had telegraphed to Washington to authorize him to offer a reward. I told Danney I did not think there was a word of truth in the report. I told the President and we hitched up and went to Oren Randal's. Stayed there the balance of the night. . . .

the 12[th] At Randals all day. About six o'clock Bro Woolley went to the city. Just after, D[aniel] R. B[ateman] came and brought the news we were not to move. It was a false report. Bro Woolley got back just before two o'clock with the same news, so we went back to Bro Woolley. (Diary of Samuel Bateman, October 11, 12, 1886)

President Taylor and company returned to the Woolley home the following day and remained until the 3rd of November. On November 1st, President Taylor celebrated his 78th and last birthday at the home of Lorin Woolley:

Nov the 1 President John Taylor's birthday. He is 78 years old. Looks stormy. I went out hunting early this morning. At night we were all invited over to Lorin C. Woolley's to supper. Present at supper, 18 brethren and sisters and 7 children, J. E. Taylor being present. We had a splendid time. Dismissed at 10 o'clock. (Diary of Samuel Bateman, November 1, 1886)

On November 3rd, President Taylor and party removed to the home of William White and Sons where they remained until the 9th. On the 9th they returned to the Woolley home and stayed until the 22nd, at which time they moved to the residence of Thomas F. Rouche in Kaysville. President Taylor resided at the Rouche home until the 25th of July, 1887, when he died.

The Woolley's involvement with President Taylor continued from the time he left their home until the time of his death. The new DO. was located about 10 miles farther north from their home, and running the Church from the underground required almost all business to be transacted by mail. During this period of time, the Woolley home became the "Half Way House" between the President's hideout and headquarters in Salt Lake City. The mail was usually left at their residence to be carried later by others to the DO. Visitors to see the President would stop off at the "Half Way House" and continue on their journey with the mail carriers when they came to pick up the mail. Often there were meetings at the Woolley home between high church officials and George Q. Cannon. John W. or Lorin C. Woolley would frequently take the mail the rest of the way out to the DO. and sometimes they delivered it to Salt Lake City. There was both out-going and in-coming mail every day and it was usually sent at night to avoid notice. Bateman makes reference to these things almost daily in his diary. The following are a few examples:

Met D[aniel] R. B[ateman] at Bro [John W.] Woolley's with the out [going] mail, we changed. I got back at 12 o'clock. (November 24, 1886)

Bro. [John W.] Woolley came at 5 o'clock this morning with the mail. Went right back. C[harles] H. W[ilkens] went with the mail. Got back at half past 11 o'clock. (November 26, 1886)

At night, I went with the mail, G. Q. Cannon went with me. Met D[aniel] R. B[ateman] at Bro. Woolley's. We went on to the city. D[aniel] R. B[ateman] and Lorin Woolley went to Bro. Rouche's with the out-going mail. (December 8, 1886)

C[harles] H. Wilkins went with the mail. L. J[ohn] Nuttall went with him. Lorin C. Woolley came with the mail at half past 12 o'clock [a.m.] (December 10, 1886)

During President Taylor's stay at the Rouche home, John Woolley often came to visit and sometimes stayed for more than a day at a time. Often John

Woolley, and probably his son Lorin, would attend Sunday meetings and fast meetings with President Taylor and others who resided at the Rouche home. Fast meetings were held regularly every fourth Thursday, and Sunday meetings were held every Sabbath at the DO. The following is a typical example:

Had fast meeting, Bro. Woolley presiding, 9 brethren 3 sisters, 1 child present. All the Brethren spoke but one. Sister Rouche spoke. Had a good meeting. Bro. Woolley went back and took the mail, he took one goose. Bro. Solomon and I beat the Boss* and Bro. Woolley pitching quoits. (December 2, 1886)

Cannon Activities

George Q. Cannon would go and consult with the brethren of the committee, I taking him back and forth each day. (*The Polygamy Story: Fiction and Fact*, P. 5)

Woolley's description of Cannon's activities, i.e. leaving the Do. each day to consult with the brethren of the committee, could hardly have been described more accurately, especially in contrast to President Taylor. The difference is striking; Cannon was always on the go. Not only was this typical of Cannons activities during his stay at the Woolley home, but for the entire underground period. For some reason Taylor managed to tend most of his business through correspondence, while Cannon managed his by going out to "consult with the brethren". It was because of his frequent movements that he was finally captured. The following are the entries in the Bateman diary which notice Cannons movements during his stay at the Woolley home:

September *the 16* . . . . at night [I, Samuel Bateman] carried the mail. *George Q. Cannon went with me*. . . .

September *the 18* . . . . *G. Q Cannon* and C[harles] H. W[ilkins] went away, took the mail.

September *the 19 Sunday* . . . . *George Q. Cannon* and C. H. Wilkin came back at night

September *the 22* . . . . At night went with the mail. *Bro G. Q. Cannon went with me.* Went to Frank Armstrong's. Met Abram Cannon, *James Jack, and John T. Caine. Left G. Q. C. there*. . . .

September *the 23* . . . . *George Q. Cannon returned* at two o'clock, he woke us up. He was very sick with cramp in the stomach. We worked with him for two hours administering another simple remedy before he got asleep. H. C. Birrell sat up with him the balance of the night. He was quite a bit better in the morning.

September *the 29* . . . . At night, went with the mail. D[aniel] R. Bateman went out in my place [as Do. guard?] *G. Q. Cannon went with me* . . . . Left G. Q. C. in the city . . . . I went on home . . . . I staid all night.

September *the 30* [I, Samuel Bateman stayed] All day at home.

October *the 4* . . . . I went with the mail. *Took George Reynolds back to the city*. Saw C. H. Crown and *G. Q. C.* He is better

October *the 6* . . . . At night went with the mail. John E. Woolley and Wife went with me. Called at B's. *G Q Cannon came back with me.*

October *the 22* C H Wilkin went with the mail. *G. Q. Cannon went with him*. . . .

October *the 23* . . . . Bro *G. Q. C. came bac*k with Bro. Alfred Solomon.

October *the 26* . . . . At night C. H. W. went with the mail. *G. Q. Cannon went with him* and went to his home. Got back at 2 o'clock

November *the 1* . . . . C H Wilkin went with the mail, *G. Q. Cannon went with him.*

November *the 8* . . . . At night C. H. W. *went out with G. Q Cannon* and took the mail. . . . *G. Q. C.* and C. H. W. got back at one o'clock.

November *the 16* . . . . At night C H W went with the mail. *G Q Cannon* and J. E. Taylor went with him. He and Bro *G. Q. C*. and A M Cannon came with him. Got back at 3 o'clock. . .

November *the 20* . . . . At night, went with the mail. Took *G. Q. Cannon to the President's office*, then took him down home. . .

Woolley stated that he escorted Cannon back and forth each day. If this is the case there is no evidence in the Bateman diary to prove it, at least not during the presidents stay at the Woolley residence. However, after the Do. was relocated further north at the Roueche home, there were times when he did, and as we shall see, once in particular, on a very significant day. We should realize too, that Samuel Bateman's diary is the ony record available with information on this matter, and it is unreasonable to suppose that he was always around to witness all things, neither can we expect that in his brief diary entries he recorded all that he saw. It is evident that Bateman only occasionally mentioned the comings and goings of the Woolley family members.

George Q. Cannon had his own personal body guard, Charles H. Wilkins, but judging from Bateman's record Cannon made many trips under the escort of other guards. We must remember that Wilkins also had a private life. Neither is it at all unlikely, that from time to time, one or two others might also go along for companies sake on the return trip, or for added protection.

The September 26th, 1886 Meeting

"George Q. Cannon on his own initiative selected a committee comprising himself, Hyrum B. Clawson, Franklin S. Richards, John T. Caine, and james Jack to get up a statement or Manifesto that would meet the objections urged by the Brethren above named. They met from time to time to discuss the situation. From the White

home, where President Taylor and companions stopped, after leaving the Carlisle home, they came out to Father's. George Q. Cannon would go and consult with the brethren of the committee, I taking him back and forth each day.

On September 26, 1886, George Q. Cannon, Hyrum B. Clawson, Franklin S. Richards, and others met with President John Taylor at my father's residence at Centerville, Davis County, Utah, and presented a document for President Taylor's consideration." (Lorin Woolley Story)

Capitulation was a discussion which started well before the underground days and never ended until the manifesto of 1890, nevertheless, there were at least three occasions during President Taylor's administration, which history points to, namely the 1885 manifesto which Dr. George Miller presented, the answer to the obvious question of the 1886 revelation, and the controversey over the Scott Amendment in 1887.

Conclusion

It is this period of time, from September 1885, when the DO. was located at the Carlisle residence, to July, 1887, when President Taylor died, that must be carefully considered in order to completely evaluate the truthfulness of the Woolley Story and not just two days in September 1886. Unfortunately, Anderson has refused to recognize this and has resorted to character assassination and straining at gnats. As the growing number of Fundamentalists becomes increasingly aware of what looks very much like a concerted cover-up of the crucial evidence, books like Anderson's (while better than what has gone before) will continue to be as half-hearted and inconclusive as are all the howlings in the night about the historicity of the Mormon story itself.

---

*Boss was a code name for President Taylor.